

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

*Ex parte* JEAN XU YU

---

Appeal 2012-007341  
Application 11/972,030  
Technology Center 2400

---

Before MAHSHID D. SAADAT, JEFFREY A. STEPHENS, and  
KEVIN C. TROCK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SAADAT, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellant<sup>1</sup> appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a final rejection of claims 1–25, which are all the claims pending in this application. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Appellant, the real party in interest is International Business Machines Corporation (App. Br. 2).

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

### *Introduction*

Appellant's invention relates to managing transactions between a service client and a service provider (*see* Abstract). Claim 1, which is illustrative of the invention, reads as follows:

1. A computer implemented method for managing a transaction between a service client and a service provider, the computer implemented method comprising:

receiving a request from a Web services client application;

extracting a correlation token and a unique transaction handle associated with the correlation token from the request, forming an extracted correlation token and an extracted transaction handle;

generating a child correlation token using the extracted correlation token as a parent correlation token;

generating a unique transaction handle associated with the child correlation token; starting a timer associated with the unique transaction handle and child correlation token; performing the request; stopping the timer associated with the unique transaction handle;

inserting the extracted transaction handle in a response to the request; and

transmitting the response with the extracted transaction handle to the Web services client application.

### *Rejections on Appeal*

The Examiner rejected claims 1–3, 6–9, 12–15, and 18–25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chagoly (US 7,424,720 B2; Sept. 9, 2008) (*see* Ans. 4–9); and further added Stoyanova (US 2007/0174288 A1; July 26, 2007) to reject claims 4, 10, 16, and 17 (*See* Ans. 10–11); Haynie (US 2006/0036448 A1; Feb. 16, 2006) to reject claim 5 (*See* Ans. 11–12);

and Barrett (US 2006/0168268 A1; July 27, 2006) to reject claim 11 (*see* Ans. 12–13).

## ANALYSIS

We have reviewed the Examiner’s rejections in light of Appellant’s arguments that the Examiner has erred. We disagree with Appellant’s conclusions. We adopt as our own the findings and reasons set forth by the Examiner in the action from which this appeal is taken and the reasons set forth by the Examiner in the Examiner’s Answer in response to Appellant’s Appeal Brief (*see* Ans. 13–16). However, we highlight and address specific findings and arguments for emphasis as follows.

### *Claim 1*

Appellant argues the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 as being obvious over Chagoly because the reference does not teach or suggest an extracted “correlating token” or an extracted transaction handle that is inserted in a response to a received request (App. Br. 13–16). The Examiner points to the disclosure of Chagoly in columns 1 and 2 and explains the correlating tokens have to be first inserted before they are passed (Ans. 13 (citing Chagoly, col. 1, l. 65 – col. 2, l. 13)). The Examiner further finds Chagoly discloses passing a *unique correlating token* from component A to component B, and in response component B passes back the original token (Ans. 13–14 (citing Chagoly, col. 2, ll. 7–19)). The Examiner asserts that passing the original token requires extracting it from the request and inserting the extracted token in the response from component B to component A (*id.*). The Examiner also finds the correlation tokens described in Chagoly contain a unique transaction ID, which the Examiner interprets as a unique transaction handle (Ans. 14 (citing Chagoly, col. 4, ll.

56–60)). We agree with the Examiner. Contrary to Appellant’s contention that the disclosure of passing back a token does not teach extracting and inserting a transaction handle (Reply Br. 2–3), the broadest reasonable interpretation of claim 1 does not preclude a transaction handle that is a part of the correlation token. We also agree with the Examiner that the cited portions in column 4 of Chagoly describing a correlation token that contains a unique transaction ID (as unique transaction handles) and retrieval of the correlation tokens with the “getParentCorrelator” function implies that the correlation tokens and information they contain (e.g., transaction handles) are first extracted from the request and inserted in the response in order to be passed back (Ans. 14 (citing Chagoly, col. 4, ll. 20–37, 56–60)).

We are also unpersuaded by Appellant’s contention that Chagoly does not teach or suggest the limitation of “generating a child correlation token” and “generating a unique transaction handle associated with the child correlation token” (App. Br. 16–18). As explained by the Examiner (Ans. 15), Chagoly discloses two or more transactions and their descendant transactions with parent/child relationships where each transaction has a correlating token including a unique ID or handle (see Chagoly, col. 4, ll. 51–55 and col. 5, ll. 5–19). We are further unpersuaded by Appellant’s argument (Reply Br. 4) that the cited portions related to those transactions having parent/child relationships do not teach or suggest the claimed step of generating a child correlation token. As found by the Examiner (Ans. 15), the cited portion in column 4 of Chagoly describes child or sub transactions that may have other sub transactions, which is consistent with Appellant’s own disclosure of how “a new child correlation token is created using the client side child correlation token as the parent correlation token” (*see* Spec. ¶ 61). In other words, the disclosed parent/child relationship among

transactions in Chagoly provides for using the parent transaction token to generate the transaction tokens of the descendant transactions or a child correlation transaction in a sub transaction.

Lastly, Appellant argues the cited portion of Chagoly does not teach or suggest “starting a timer associated with the unique transaction handle and child correlation token” after performing the request (App. Br. 18). We also agree with the Examiner’s explanation (Ans. 5–6) that measuring the amount of time elapsed before completing the transaction disclosed in column 4 of Chagoly implies a timer is started and stopped before performing the request and after completing the request.

*Claims 6 and 25*

Appellant presents arguments similar to those presented for claim 1 regarding the “extracting” and “inserting” steps (App. Br. 19–22). We agree with the Examiner’s findings and conclusions regarding claim 6 and adopt them as our own (see Ans. 7–9).

*Claim 8*

Appellant contends the cited portions in columns 1, 2, and 4 of Chagoly simply disclose using correlating tokens to monitor a transaction and include no description of “a ‘module’ that manipulated both (1) a header of a *request* as well as (2) a header of a *response* in order to **extract/insert** correlation tokens and unique transaction handles” (App. Br. 20). We also agree with the Examiner that tokens inserted in a separate response message must be extracted from the request (*see* Ans. 16 (citing Chagoly, col. 4, ll. 20–37)). Contrary to Appellant’s argument that the Examiner has provided a new basis for rejecting claim 8 (Reply Br. 4–5), the Examiner’s response merely clarifies the proposed rejection. As explained by the Examiner (Ans. 16), using a module for extracting the token from the request header based

on the disclosed system protocol would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled artisan.

### CONCLUSIONS

On the record before us, we conclude that the Examiner has not erred in finding Chagoly teaches or suggests all the disputed claim limitations. Accordingly, we sustain the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 1, 6, 8, and 25, as well as the remaining claims that are not argued separately (see App. Br. 22–23), as being obvious over Chagoly, alone or in combination with the other prior art of record.

### DECISION

The Examiner’s decision to reject claims 1–25 is affirmed.<sup>2</sup>

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

### AFFIRMED

lv

---

<sup>2</sup> We have decided the appeal before us. However, should there be further prosecution of claims 12–17, the Examiner is invited to consider these claims for their compliance with the statutory subject matter requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 101 in view of the disclosure in paragraphs 71–73 of the instant Specification, the guidelines discussed in David J. Kappos, *Subject Matter Eligibility of Computer Readable Media*, 1351 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 212 (Feb. 23, 2010), and *In re Nuijten*, 500 F.3d 1346, 1356–57 (Fed. Cir. 2007).